

about how we should take this "surplus" and how we should spend it. And as my colleague from South Carolina has said, what that means is, if we got a surplus, there are all kinds of ideas how people are now suggesting that this surplus stays here in Washington and we spend it rather than securing our future for the next generation or paying down the debt or reducing the taxes. It seems like there are a lot of people who believe Washington should be first in line and we ought to accelerate now that growth in spending, and that is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me go into one area so that we are completely honest with the American public.

The President has sent the House and the Senate a supplemental bill. There is great debate on what the deficit is in terms of the need of our military, especially now when we are now exposed on one front and potentially exposed on another front. There is no question that we have underfunded the requirements to have a readiness capable military. There is some debate about the money.

But the American public needs to make known to this body and to the Senate that if in fact they do not want Social Security money used to pay for that, they better let their representatives know it, because that is exactly what is going to happen.

The group of gentlemen that are with me have routinely fought to pay for everything that we do up here by cutting some program somewhere else. I do not believe that is going to happen this time, and it is not ever going to happen until we continue to contrast that when we spend money, that we are not willing to have the courage to cut spending somewhere else.

Where are we getting the money? We are stealing it from Social Security. We should not run from that issue. We should talk about that issue. And as we talk about it, I believe the public will demand on the body politic in this country to do the sharpening and cut the fat and promote the efficiency that we need.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, Madeleine Albright came and testified before one of the committees that I am on, the Committee on International Relations, today, and she testified before the Senate yesterday. And on this very point, I think her reply was interesting, because when asked, should we offset the proposed supplemental for Kosovo, the answer was no, because if we did that it would mean money could come out of USAID, the State Department and a host of other priorities, as she put it, here in Washington.

The simple question the people need to ask back home is, is USAID and State Department spending a higher priority for them or is the money going to their Social Security a higher priority, is a question that needs to be asked.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely. And it needs to be raised and continue to be

talked about so that Washington hears. I know what that answer is in the American public. It is the same everywhere. "Get your hands off my Social Security money. Make the hard choices somewhere else."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think the other interesting question is not only to ask is this more important than Social Security, it is if we are risking young men and young women's lives in Kosovo, is there no place else in the budget that we could find \$6 billion? Is the only thing to say it is an emergency, not say everything else is as equal of a priority?

I think as we have taken a look at all of this, we spend \$1.7 trillion per year. We all know that there is lots of bureaucracy, there is lots of red tape. There are other places where, if we really went after it, we could find the dollars to fund this without raiding Social Security and be able to do Kosovo and just say for those Members that believe it, this mission in Kosovo is so important we are willing to reduce spending in some other areas because this is a new priority.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on that because I think sometimes that does get lost in this whole debate.

This budget we are talking about this year is \$1,700 billion. Even \$6 billion, which I think is a little bit pricey for what we hope to achieve in Kosovo, but that is a separate debate, even that, though, represents a relatively small percent and about one-half of 1 percent of the total Federal budget. So the idea that we cannot find the money with offsets somewhere else in the budget, I think outside of this Capitol and outside of the circle here in Washington, I think most people do not believe that.

But I want to come back to another point, and really it does come back to in terms of our cost for defense in these special supplemental appropriations and I think it is an important one. I think the American people need to know that over the last 40 years, up until the last 8 years, the United States had deployed troops around the world 8 times, but in the last 8 years, we have deployed troops 33 times. And I think sometimes we have to ask, is all of this really that necessary? Is it worthwhile? I mean, this is an enormous expense to the taxpayers.

I think there is another question that needs to be asked before we vote on the supplemental, and that is about burden sharing. When President Bush decided that we had to stand up to Saddam Hussein, he went to our allies and he got them to pony up. And the net was the war in the desert actually made money for us. We actually came out ahead on the Desert Storm operation.

I think it is time for us to be brutally honest with our allies in Europe, that if they want us to help participate in a war that is really much more important to Europe than it is to people of the United States, then there ought to be a better cost sharing, a burden sharing.

Because right now, basically, our obligation to NATO is to pick up between 22 and 25 percent of the cost. Some of us believe that is still a little bit steep. But right now we are flying 75 percent of the sorties, we are delivering 90 percent of the ordnance, and I suspect when the accounting is done, we are shouldering about 75 to 90 percent of the cost of this operation.

And those are legitimate questions and I think we, as representatives of the people of the United States, have a right to ask those questions and demand honest answers.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to close this out. One of my heroes is Martin Luther King. And I have said this many times on this floor, but I do not think it could be said often enough, his last major speech that he made was at the National Cathedral here in Washington; and in that speech he said, "Cowardice asks the question, is it expedient? And vanity asks the question, is it popular? But conscience asks the question, is it right?"

It is popular to not talk about the problems we have with Social Security. It is politically very expedient not to be honest about the budget. But it is not right. And until this body, all sides of the body, until the executive branch starts becoming honest and accurate with the words they use about our budget and our situation with Social Security, we are not going to solve the problems.

We have to ask the right questions. And the first question we have to ask is, "is it right?"

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 999, BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CLEANUP AND HEALTH ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-103) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes, which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEMOCRATS CELEBRATE EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Democrats are celebrating Earth Day, which is tomorrow, by continuing our efforts to leave a real environmental legacy for this year and future years, for this generation and for the next generation. And we are proving that environmental protection and economic competitiveness are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they will be